

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/845,267	05/01/2001	Timothy Merrick Long	169.2039	3091	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER		
			CHAMPAGNE, DONALD		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3622		
•			DATE MAILED: 08/25/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/845,267	LONG, TIMOTHY MERRICK
Examiner	Art Unit
Donald L. Champagne	3622

	Donald L. Champagne	3622	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 25 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL		="	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31: or (3)
 a)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	s of the date of e appeal. Since
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See the reply to item "11" below.</u> . (See 37 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	maliant Amandment	DTOL 204
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphant Amendment	P10L-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil ided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 25,29-31 and 37-41. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41,33(d)(1	ls to provide a).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)	
13. Other:		Donald L. Champaç	ne
	DONALD L. CHAMPAGNE PRIMARY EXAMINER	Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3622	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The substance of both the amendment and the arguments has been considered in the last Office action (mailed on 25 May 2006).

For example, claim 25 has now been limited to "a plurality of different non-advertising applications". Claim 25 was rejected (para. 4 of the 25 May 2005 Office action) by reference to "whatever content is being shown in the non-advertising area of electronic page 32". That implies a plurality of non-advertising applications.

As to the arguments, on p. 9 (last two sentences of the first full para.), applicant argues

"Thus, Angles is not seen to disclose or to suggest a display area being adapted to display advertising information independently of a non-advertising application being run on the information appliance. Rather, the display of Angles' customized advertisement 30 is seen to be dependent on the user's internet browser software being run."

The browser is irrelevant. The rejection, of claim 25, for example (para. 4), notes that said "application" is WHATEVER (emphasis added) content is being run, which means whatever application is being run, a music video, a spreadsheet, or whatever.

On p.8, first sentence of the second para., applicant takes issue with the examiner's use of "content" for "application". Applicant has a valid grammatical point, but it has no bearing on the patentability of the claims over the cited prior art.